

Appl. No. : 10/714,097
Filed : November 14, 2003

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 18, 19, and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara (US 20020065728).

Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara, as discussed above, in view of Schuessler (US 20010045461).

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara/Schuessler, as discussed above, in view of Kaufman et al.

Claims 18 and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracy et al. (US 6550672).

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.c. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracy et al., as discussed above, in view of Ogasawara, as discussed above.

Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracy et al., as discussed above, in view of Schuessler, as discussed above.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracy et al. in view of Schuessler, as discussed above, in view of Kaufman et al., as discussed above.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.c. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracy et al, as discussed above, in view of Swartz et al. (US 6655597).

Appl. No. : **10/714,097**
Filed : **November 14, 2003**

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracy et al. in view of Ogasawara, as discussed above, in view of Swartz et al, as discussed above.

In order to obviate these rejections, claim 1 is amended herein to : 1) include the limitations of both claim 28 therein that recites a dual type barcode with two different parts, and 2) also the subject matter from the specification page 12 last three lines which explains that multiple scans along multiple lines are carried out, but this is done using a camera, the whole image is obtained and later processed using processing techniques to obtain the information.

None of this is in any way cited way shown by the cited prior art. Ogasawara does shows scanning using a camera, but shows nothing about obtaining of image of a bar code of the type claimed which has both first and second parts, where that operation is obtaining a whole image of the dual type bar code and later processing the image to obtain information using a processor to obtain the information from said first part and said second part. Nothing in Ogasawara shows or makes obvious this subject matter of obtaining multiple different bar codes parts of this type in a whole image of a dual type bar code. .

Schuessler shows a dual type bar-code, where one bar-code is used in conjunction with the other bar-code. However, nothing in Schuessler shows obtaining this using a camera where the whole image is obtained and later

processed using processing techniques, as claimed. The remaining claim should be

Claims 18 and 58-59 stood alternatively rejected based on Tracy. Tracy, however, has however, many of the limitations discussed above with respect to Ogasawara. Specifically, nothing in Tracy discloses or makes obvious obtaining a whole image with multiple bar-code parts therein and later processing it to obtain the scan information, as claimed. As disclosed herein, this system is produces the significant advantage that is going can be obtained which allows encoding bar-code which otherwise might need to be scanned in multiple directions, such as in claim 30.

This is not shown or otherwise made obvious by the cited prior art.

Applicant herewith cancels the non elected claims. New claims 60-63 are provided to replace the now-cancelled claims. These new claims recite obtaining a whole image of the two different bar code parts of the bar code; and later processing the image to obtain information using a processor to obtain the information from said first part and said second part. Hence these new claims should be allowable for analogous reasons to those discussed above.

In view of the above, applicant believes all claims should be in condition for allowance, and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. : 10/714,097
Filed : November 14, 2003

Please charge any unpaid fees due in connection with this response(small entity) to Deposit Account No. 50-1387.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _11/9/2009_____

___/Scott C Harris/_____
Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 23844
Scott C. Harris, Esq.
P.O. Box 927649
San Diego, CA 92192
Telephone: (619) 823-7778
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717